

PMBP Reassessment 2000 Recommendations

1. Retain the USACE Strategic Vision.

☐ **Concur** ☐ **Concur with comment** ☐ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: With retained focus on the Strategic Vision (Vision) we ensure continued forward progress on the path to building the “world’s premier engineering organization...prepared for the 21st century.”

Observations: The Vision has been well received. The interviews and web based survey indicate that all levels of the Corps, from the highest executives to student hires in remote field offices, know of the Vision. Investment in the Vision is reshaping our culture, and is leading us to be the world’s premier engineering organization.

Findings: Cultural change does not happen overnight. Organization and mission can change but the Vision is timeless. We need to stay the course and continue the momentum. With retained focus on the Vision we ensure continued forward progress.

2 (a). Change the first imperative in ER 5-1-11 (ER) to read: “All work is an integral part of project delivery.”

☐ **Concur** ☐ **Concur with comment** ☐ **Non-Concur**

2 (b). Establish the Project Delivery Team (PDT) as the foundational unit for performing all work. Change the title of the ER and the process it describes to the “USACE Project Delivery Process” (USACE-PDP).

☐ **Concur** ☐ **Concur with comment** ☐ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “Make life simple for all - develop and use common business processes throughout the Corps.”

Observations: A great number of the employees interviewed did not know of the ER or the principles of project management. Most of the survey respondents did not believe the ER is related to their job, and in fact, many have not even read it. Most thought the ER was only for people in Programs and Project Management Division (PPMD).

Findings: The project definition imperative in the ER is used by some to exclude themselves from the USACE-PDP. Clearly stating that all work is part of project delivery will eliminate this opportunity. People have not read the ER because ERs are usually narrowly focused at specific technical areas, and people assume that an ER titled “Program and Project Management” applies only to PPMD. This has prevented many technical and support staff from fully understanding the process. It is evident from the interviews that the ER would be better known and understood if it had been marketed to

the workforce like the Strategic Vision. The title of the ER and the process it describes needs to be clear, concise and recognized as applicable to all USACE elements.

3. Review all existing and freeze all new USACE policies (regulations, circulars, directives, letters, memoranda, and operating procedures). Establish a standing Project Delivery Team (PDT), reporting directly to the DCG, to review and revise all policies for consistency with the USACE-PDP.

☐ **Concur** ☐ **Concur with comment** ☐ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “Develop innovative approaches to dramatically increase unity of effort and a corporate approach to business - “All for one and one for all””

Observations: The survey, interviews, and personal experiences of the team all recognize that many USACE policies are not synchronized or are in conflict with each other, the USACE-PDP and/or the Vision.

Findings: Policy documents were prepared by various proponent groups in HQUSACE. Many policies were written years ago and have not been updated. Therefore, many policies conflict with the USACE-PDP.

4. Indoctrinate the entire USACE workforce in the USACE-PDP.

☐ **Concur** ☐ **Concur with comment** ☐ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “Develop Corps doctrine and tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) focused on district and division operations.” “Make a quantum leap - reinforce project management as the process we use to manage project delivery.”

Observations: USACE staff at all levels neither have a clear understanding of the PDP nor the project management matrix concept that will be used to drive the process. Many PDT members have not been exposed to the ER nor have senior leaders fully grasped the process.

Findings: USACE did not indoctrinate the USACE-PDP throughout the Corps on a systematic and continuous basis. If this had been done, it would have resulted in improved overall implementation and greater efficiencies in executing projects by PDT. Without planned indoctrination there will continue to be confusion and lack of a clarified direction on fully implementing the project management matrix concept adopted by USACE.

5. Empower Commanders to affect high-graded developmental assignments within their command, pending concurrence of the senior rater at the next higher level.

☐ **Concur** ☐ **Concur with comment** ☐ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “We will seek and develop a workforce with diverse attributes and talents.”

Observations: Some senior leaders who have served in the same organizational element for all or most of their careers, tend to have views that are not corporate. This viewpoint can create real or perceived imbalances of relationships.

Findings: Developmental assignments have not been fully utilized to develop inter-organizational experience in the senior leadership. This lack of experience has to some extent negatively impacted corporate teamwork, implementation of the PDP and performance of the PDT.

6. Direct a synchronized and integrated implementation of the USACE-PDP.

Linkage to vision: “Focus periodic command reviews on implementation of campaign plans and accomplishment of strategic goals and objectives.”

Observations: The USACE-PDP is not uniformly applied. USACE commands are implementing the USACE-PDP inconsistently when compared to implementation of the Vision.

Findings: HQUSACE has not established a strategic plan to orderly implement the USACE-PDP. Divisions must prepare regional campaign plans and districts must develop operation plans. Headquarters and Divisions should evaluate the implementation of each plan using a PDT.

7. Align all USACE echelons using three groups: Programs & Projects Management (Combat Arms)-Technical Services (Combat Support)- Support Services (Combat Services Support).

____ **Concur**

____ **Concur with comment**

____ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “Organize at each echelon to align with the Corps Vision and Strategic Plan. Starting at the top and flowing throughout the organization...organize to align to new processes.”

Observations: Military organizations are aligned to be interoperable at all echelons, thereby facilitating command and control. A corporate goal is to align HQUSACE and MSCs to match that of the districts. Our observations document that there is no standard district alignment making achievement of the higher order goal impossible. We have a unique opportunity to build a symbiosis of our military and civilian structure to capitalize on a uniform alignment to achieve the Vision.

Findings: HQUSACE has not determined a standard organizational alignment. The war fighting organization is designed to identify, engage and defeat the threat. Likewise, USACE command and control should be aligned to quickly meet the nation’s needs. This

will allow the command and control of any district to fall under any division and the staff coordination functions will work.

8. Establish at all USACE subordinate commands (Centers, Districts, and FOAs) a three tiered decision making structure consisting of Project Delivery Teams (PM and subject matter experts), an Operating Board (selected middle managers), and a Corporate Board (Commander and selected senior leaders).

____ **Concur**

____ **Concur with comment**

____ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “Dramatically improve vertical and horizontal communications between all echelons and functional areas.”

Observations: Too many people are making decisions because they like making decisions and no longer focus on their area of operation. Many commands effectively use middle management to operate the day-to-day business of the command (Operating Board). In commands where a three tiered decision structure was used, there was better teamwork and positive results. The team observed that most Corporate Boards and PDTs were functioning fairly well. The disconnect seemed to be everything in-between. The command and control lanes for middle management are overlapping and creating multiple layers of management. These layers confuse and reduce the effectiveness of PDTs. Other than that, interviewees and survey respondents were generally satisfied with middle management. However, the team observed that many middle managers do not think corporately.

Findings: There is no uniform decision making team structure in place at all districts. Incorporating teamwork, keeping people in their decision making lanes, and flattening the decision matrix, improves the timeliness and quality of decisions. With this structure the corporate board can focus on long-term (beyond 1 year) decision making, the operating board can focus on short-term (1 year or less) decision making and the PDTs can focus on the project. Without this structure the decision making process is slow, cumbersome and often requires reversal at a higher level. The role of middle management is not clearly defined, but is critical to promote corporate recruitment, selection, training, development, supervision, and mentoring of the USACE team.

9. Encourage all Support Services use the USACE-PDP. The Deputy Commander is responsible for Support Services.

____ **Concur**

____ **Concur with comment**

____ **Non-Concur**

Vision Link: “Operate as a team - develop incentives that reward an integrated approach to problem solving”. “We can not - must not - become fragmented in our execution this is imperative for unity of effort.”

Observations: Support services have a significant impact on the PDT's ability to effectively execute projects. For example, untimely personnel recruitment, logistic support, and provision of IT equipment and support is contributing to PDT execution failure.

Findings: The support services are critical to the USACE-PDP. It is mandatory that they support the PDTs and technical elements by using the USACE-PDP philosophy and process. However, in many cases, project management teamwork, scheduling and other processes are not used. Support services are not always represented on the corporate team, consequently, they should be represented on the Corporate Board by the Deputy Commander, and where appropriate, be represented on the Operating Board and PDTs.

10. Change ER-5-1-11 dealing with quality and safety to convey:

- Life Safety is non- negotiable.
 - Project Delivery Teams are responsible for the quality of the projects, products & technical services.
 - The PDT resolves disputes over quality at the lowest echelons possible.
- Otherwise, the PDT, including the DPM and Technical Chief(s), will jointly present the issues to the Commander.
- The Commander has ultimate responsibility for quality and safety.

___ Concur

___ Concur with comment

___ Non-Concur

Vision Link: "We produce products and services that fully meet customer expectations of quality..."

Observations: Alarming, unilateral decisions are being made under duress of schedule pressures without full regard for technical input. People have expressed concern that projects are being completed where quality has not been a primary consideration.

Findings: Quality is a major project objective. Considering the significance of resulting potential for quality failure, a resolution process must be established and implemented. The project should not be driven by cost and schedule at the expense of quality and safety.

"All worked together to craft *this report*. This was a true team effort. We now need a full team effort to implement it."

- USACE-PDP Assessment Team